

REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner, shown in small, bold type.

**4. Claims 16-18 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marketkar et al.**

...  
**As to Claim 16, Marketkar et al. discloses: a circuit board 300; a bus 112 arranged on circuit board 300 (p.3, [0047]); electromagnetic couplers (flex circuits 354 corresponding to plural sockets 700) defined at locations along the bus 112 (Figs. 2, 3, 13 and 14; p.3, [0044]; p6, [0086]); base 710 of rigid sockets 700 (**Figs. 13-16; p.6: [0086] and p.8: [0106]**) having electromagnetic couplers 354 and contacts 750, 760 for connection to contact pads 581-584 of device boards 352 (p.6: [0090]); the rigid sockets 700 being mounted to define interfaces across which electromagnetic coupling of signals can occur between the electromagnetic couplers (lines 311 and 312) defined along bus 112 and the electromagnetic couplers 354 on sockets 700 (Figs. 2, 3 and 14, p.3, [0047]).**

...  
**10. Applicant's arguments filed January 20, 2004 have been fully considered by they are not persuasive with respect to the 35 USC § 102(e) rejections of Claims 16-18 and 21-24 over Marketkar et al. ...**

The Applicant has amended independent Claims 16, 21, and 23 to further limit the sockets be rigid sockets. However, the sockets 700 of Marketkar et al. are clearly rigid structures whose rigid walls support both the electromagnetic coupler (i.e., flex circuit 354) and the embedded contacts 750 and 760 that electromechanically secure and connect the device boards 352 plugged into the sockets (Figs. 13-16; p.6: [0086] and p.8: [0106]). Accordingly, amended independent claims 16, 21, and 23 remain rejected over Marketkar et al. in the instant amended Application.

The applicant has amended claim 16 to recite that the electromagnetic couplers are rigid. Marketkar neither anticipates nor would have made obvious the invention recited in claim 16. In Marketkar et al., the electromagnetic couplers associated with the connectors are not rigid, as shown in figures 11 and 12 and described at ¶¶ [0057] and [0060]. Claims 21 and 23 and the dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons.

**6. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Marketkar et al. in view of Benham et al., ...**

Claim 19 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

**7. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Marketkar et al. In view of Ishibashi et al. ...**

Claim 20 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

**8 Claims 1-7 and 9-15, 25-26 and 27-31 have been allowed.**

**9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter in view of Applicant's instant Amendment cited above:**

**As to Claims 1-7 and 9-15, patentability resides in the limitation wherein the connector comprises a rigid coupling element, and the first electromagnetic coupler is formed on a surface of the rigid coupling element, in combination with the other limitations of base Claim 1.**

**As to Claims 25-26, patentability resides in *using a force that causes viscous material to be squeezed and to flow to fill air gaps between the sockets and the circuit board*, in combination with the other limitations of base Claim 25.**

**As to Claims 27-31, patentability resides *in a viscous liquid on the first electromagnetic coupler*, in combination with the other limitations of base Claim 27.**

The applicant acknowledges that the examiner has allowed these claims. The applicant notes that there may be other good reasons for patentability of these claims and of other claims.

The fact that the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner that have not been addressed. The fact that the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. The fact that the applicant has made claim amendments does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to those claims.

Enclosed is a Enter \$ amount check for excess claim fees and a Enter \$ amount check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Yinan Wu et al.  
Serial No. : 10/077,593  
Filed : February 14, 2002  
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-684001 / P13288

Date: 6/21/04

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20856744.doc

Respectfully submitted,



David L. Feigenbaum  
Reg. No. 30,378